

REMARKS

Applicants submit the present paper to place the application in better form for appeal. Specifically, non-elected claims 42-57 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and Applicants submit that claims 69-74, which were added following the Restriction Requirement, and which recite method and computer-readable medium features similar to the system features in elected claims 7-9, are incorrectly listed in the Office Action as being withdrawn. Those claims (69-74) have never been subject to restriction and have not been withdrawn. In the discussion below, Applicants assume that claims 69-74 would be rejected under the same grounds applied to claims 7-9.

And as a final note on this paper, the present paper amends claims 7 and 72 to correct a spelling mistake in claim 72, and to remove an extraneous feature from claim 7. These amendments are not believed to require further search or consideration.

Applicants also request reconsideration of the rejection, which relies on an alleged combination of Shore (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0149662) and Business (Business Editors and High-Tech Writers, *ASAP to Enable E-commerce Companies to Go WAP!*, Business Wire. New York, March 7, 2000).

All of the pending independent claims recite, *inter alia*, transmission of a program “... to extend the vendor device’s display interface to said mobile device.” In the alleged combination of Shore and Business, what is the alleged vendor device display interface that is being extended to the phone? Business mentions, in a single sentence, that “[y]ou can even buy a can of coke from a vending machine, all with your cell phone,” but there is no discussion of extending a display interface of that vending machine to the cell phone. Indeed, there isn’t even any mention of the vending machine’s display interface, what it looks like, or how it is extended.

The vending machine mentioned in Business is not described as having any such display interface, or extending it to a mobile device. As for the other reference, Shore, its online computer application 3407 (also cited to show a vendor device in para. 0487) is described as a computer application that transmits a remaining balance amount to the PayStick, but there is no mention that this remaining balance is somehow part of a vendor device display interface that is being extended to the mobile device. The Office Action cites several other portions of Shore as well, all of which were addressed in Applicants' previous response, and none of which shows the vending machine extending such a display interface. Further, Applicants previously noted that in some of those cited portions, the user is actually initiating the purchase of theater tickets at home, before going to the theater, and not "automatically when the wireless mobile device enters a transmission range of the wireless transmission channel port," as also recited in the independent claims.

Applicants respectfully request entry of the present paper, to place the application in better form for appeal. Alternatively, Applicants also submit that the current rejection of record cannot stand. If additional discussion and/or amendment would be helpful, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' undersigned representative at the number appearing below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 22, 2008

/Steve S. Chang/

Steve S. Chang

Reg. No. 42,402

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

1100 13th St. N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20005

202 824-3000